

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-18 are pending in the present application. New claims 14-18 have been added.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the words “standardized” and “non-standardized” are indefinite.

Throughout the pending claims:

The “standardized character” limitation has been amended to --predetermined kind of character”;

The “non-standardized image” limitation has been amended to --registered image--;

The “standardized character code” limitation has been amended to --character code--;

The “non-standardized image code” limitation has been amended to --image code--; and

The “non-standardized image data” limitation has been amended to --registered image data--

to overcome this rejection.

Applicants submit that the “predetermined kind of character” is a character that is standardized by an industrial standard, and the “registered image” is an image that is generated (or created) by a user.

In view of the foregoing amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claims 1-2, 6-8, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hyon (US Pub. 2002/0077135) in view of Baker (USP 6,546,417). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Hyon does not disclose or suggest a “display control portion having image transforming means for transforming said non-standardized image to be displayed according to said text attribute data.”

Therefore, the Examiner relies on the Baker reference and alleged that it discloses “in order to accommodate the use of different size fonts in the mailbox display, means for scaling the size of the icon graphics are also provided . . . at least one image for each icon is stored, the icon most closely matching the point size of the font is chosen and then scaled as needed to better match the font point size.”

Hyon discloses a mobile terminal in which a user can change and edit emoticons stored in the terminal (see paragraph [0044]).

Baker discloses, in Fig. 2, a mailbox displayer which lists messages together with an icon for each message (see col. 6, lines 59-61). As alleged by the Examiner, in order to accommodate the use of difference size fonts in the mailbox display, means for scaling the size of the size of the icon graphics are provided.

In other words, Hyon merely discloses emoticons that can be selected by a user, and Baker merely discloses the mailbox displayer in which the size of icons, displayed immediately to the left of the “subject” line, can be changed based on the size of fonts.

Therefore, even assuming that Hyon and Baker can be combined, which Applicants do not admit, one skilled in the art would, at best, modify the mobile terminal of Hyon such that the size of emoticons displayed immediately to the left of a text Hyon and Baker, taken singly or in combination fails to disclose or suggest “a display control portion for causing said display output portion to output corresponding said predetermined kind of character and said registered image both belonging to an identical sentence based on display data containing a series of said character code, text attribute data, and said image code, said display control portion having image transforming means for transforming said registered image to be displayed according to said text attribute data, so that said registered image is sandwiched between two parts of said text of said predetermined kind of character in a line of said identical sentence,” as recited in claim 1 (*emphasis added*).

Claims 2 and 13, dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

Claims 6-8 are allowable at least for the similar reasons as stated in the foregoing with regard to claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

(b) Claims 3-5 and 9-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hyon in view of Baker, and further in view of Ostermann et al. (USP 6,990,452). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3-5 and 9-12, variously dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

New Claims

Claims 14-18, dependent on claims 1 and 6-8, respectively, are allowable at least for their dependency on claims 1 and 6-8, respectively.

A favorable determination by the Examiner and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi Reg. No. 40,417 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/516,881  
Amendment dated December 26, 2007 (Wednesday After Holiday)  
Reply to Office Action of August 22, 2007

Docket No.: 0033-0964PUS1

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: Dec. 26, 2007 (Wed. After Holiday) Respectfully submitted,

By  (Reg. No. 39,491)  
Michael R. Cammarata  
Registration No.: 39,491  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant